

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,027	01/28/2002	Gerald Lacour	SMARTEYE.PAT	4931
7590 06/07/2006			EXAMINER	
DAVID G. HENRY			CUFF, MICHAEL A	
900 Washington Avenue, 7th Floor P.O. Box 1470			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Waco, TX 77603-1470			3627	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Арр	lication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/0	10/060,027 LACOUR ET					
		Exar	miner	Art Unit				
_		I	ael Cuff	3627				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appears o	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	ddress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE IN INSIGN STATE OF THE INSIGN	MAILING DATE C s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In munication. tatutory period will apply y will, by statute, cause t	OF THIS COMMUN In no event, however, may and will expire SIX (6) M the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this c ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	, .			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>29 March 2</i>	2006					
•—		2b) ☐ This action						
,		,		atters, prosecution as to the	e merits is			
-,	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims	·	•					
<b>4</b> )⊠	Claim(s) 7-10 is/are pending in the	application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
· -	s)⊠ Claim(s) <u></u>							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or elect	tion requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
	The specification is objected to by the	a Eveniner	•					
,	·		or h) objected t	o by the Evaminer				
السارات	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including				ER 1 121(d)			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected t	_	•					
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
_	•	for foreign priori	ty under 35 U.S.C	8 119(a)-(d) or (f)				
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
u)	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies				Stage			
	application from the Internation	•			<b>3</b> -			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action	•	, , ,	ot received.				
			·					
Attachmen	t(s)							
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (		Paper N	o(s)/Mail Date	0.450)			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o r No(s)/Mail Date	r PTO/SB/08)	5)  Notice of Other: _	of Informal Patent Application (PT)	U-13 <i>2)</i>			

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haber et al. in view of Eldridge.

Haber et al. shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying that the communications between a vehicle dealership representative and a consumer would be the object of the audio-visual record.

Haber et al. shows a system for time-stamping a digital document, for example any alphanumeric, video, audio (actuating software to run digital video and audio is inherent, evidence patents have been provided in past office actions), or pictorial data. The representation is transmitted to an outside agency (storage database). The content of a document and a time stamp of its existence are "indelibly" incorporated into the digital data of the document. (column 2, lines 55-57) If further proof were demanded upon adversary allegation, the document or video could be retrieved. (playing stored audio and video in response to an allegation) (column 8, lines 3-5) The disclosure states that in many situations there is a need to establish the date on which a document was created and to prove that the text of a document in question is in fact the same as that of the original dated document. (column 1, lines 6-9)

Art Unit: 3627

Eldridge teaches, abstract, that the growing practice by car dealers of videotaping the sales transactions is done in order to protect customers from their finance and insurance staff.

Based on the teaching of Eldridge, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Haber et al. invention to be used in a car dealership in order to protect the customers.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/060,027 Page 4

Art Unit: 3627

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael liff 5/29/06 Michael Cuff

May 29, 2006